

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Fall 12-7-1977

### Senate Meeting December 7, 1977

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting December 7, 1977" (1977). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 342.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/342>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUReD@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES  
(Not approved by the Academic Senate)

December 7, 1977

Volume IX, No. 7

Contents

Call to Order  
Roll Call  
Approval of Minutes  
Resignation of a Senator  
Seating of a New Senator  
Chairperson's Remarks  
Administrators' Remarks  
Student Body President's Remarks  
Student Evaluations Policy  
Student Elections Code  
Academic Plan  
North Central Association Report  
Committee Reports  
Communications  
Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

Academic Senate Minutes  
(Not approved by the Academic Senate)

December 7, 1977

Volume IX, No. 8

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cohen at 7:00 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

Roll Call

The Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum to be present.

Approval of Minutes

- IX, 44 A motion (Kuhn/Quane) to approve the minutes of the November 16, 1977 Senate meeting with the following correction was made. Mr. Goldstein stated that the statement attributed to him on Page 3, concerning "his feeling that courses should be taught by those in the discipline of the courses," was actually stated by Provost Horner. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Resignation of a Senator

- IX, 45 A letter of resignation was received by the Senate from Marcia Weidner, student member of the Senate. A motion (Christiansen/Rice) to accept Ms. Weidner's resignation with regrets was approved.

Seating of a New Senator

Donald Mosley was welcomed as Ms. Weidner's replacement. Mr. Mosley will serve on the Academic Affairs Committee.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Cohen announced that Karin Klappauf, clerical secretary from the Academic Senate, will be leaving her position December 16. He introduced Char Augspurger who will be replacing Ms. Klappauf.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins reported on his trip to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities meeting. One of the major areas of concern was the state of educational finance. There was not a great deal of optimism about the country about great increases in financing. The Position of the University Presidency was also discussed. The general feeling was that Presidents are caught in the middle by unrealistic external and internal pressures. Private college financing was also discussed. There was real concern expressed because of the improvement of private colleges' positions more rapidly than public institutions. Mr. Watkins stated that he is now on the Public Relations Committee

Provost Horner spoke on the Board of Higher Education meeting that he attended in Springfield. Concerns were devoted to programmatic approvals and some general discussion of budgetary matters. There was a rather lengthy discussion of the philosophy surrounding the funding of public institutions and of the support for private schools. There was discussion of moving tuition upward to the level of one-third the cost of instruction by 1980. Programmatic approvals were passed as recommended by the BHE staff with no discussion. For ISU, that means that the Bachelor's Degree in Safety has been deferred. Both the Master's Degree in Foreign Language and the joint degree in Special Education were approved with a provision that the programs will be reviewed in five years to be finally approved by the BHE. The split in the Departments of Home Economics and Industrial Technology was approved.

Internally, the Budget Team of ISU is continuing to delineate its processes for functioning. Mr. Horner stated that the information will be available to the University community in the very near future.

Mr. Watkins added that at the BOR meeting in early December, it became evident that the Board understands ISU's underfunding, and David Murray, Chairperson of the BOR, is trying to make the difficulties of ISU well-known.

#### Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Rutherford announced that the Student Association Office will be closed from December 23, 1977 to January 3, 1978.

#### Student Evaluations Policy

IX, 46

Mr. Young introduced the proposed policy. He stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee had one specific goal in mind when creating the policy, to keep the ASPT document in line with BOR policy. The Committee did not concern itself with the validity of student ratings and did not consider the possibility of a single form being used across campus. They did not decide if the evaluations should be signed or unsigned or whether a specific weighting should be given to the ratings. They operated from two principles--that students should have an opportunity to express their views of faculty and that peer evaluations of faculty should be preserved. A motion (Young/Emerson) to approve the proposed student evaluations policy was made. Mr. Young stated that if the policy is approved, suitable wording of it will be entered in the ASPT document.

IX, 47

Mr. Christiansen stated that there were some things the committee neglected to consider in their proposal. He referred to a memo from him that had been distributed among the senators. In his substitute proposal, provisions were made for the collection of evaluations each term, evaluation of faculty regardless of rank, the right of anonymity for students in evaluating faculty, and the forwarding of evaluations to College and University levels. A motion (Christiansen/Carlile) to substitute Mr. Christiansen's proposal was made for the Faculty Affairs Committee's proposal.

Ms. Patterson objected to the proposal on the grounds of her belief that students should sign evaluation forms. Mr. Quane responded that her response was similar to two received from different faculty members. He raised the question of legality in anonymity provided for students in their evaluations. According to Mr. Goleash, students are legally protected from having to sign their names, although they may do so if they wish. He expressed his concern about the rationale

for the anonymity an unsigned evaluation provides; students are a great deal more honest in their evaluations if they feel protected against the possibility of a lower grade because of their honesty. The anonymity of student evaluations is strictly a matter of University consideration and judgment.

Mr. Hicklin cited information from Page 77 of the University Handbook. According to the Handbook, anonymous statements shall have no value whatsoever in the determination of tenure. Mr. Hicklin stated that if the proposed policy is passed, the Senate will have to repeal the paragraph in the Handbook which states this. Following a case that reached the BOR, it was decided that undergraduate students are not competent to judge a professor's abilities. He also stated that he personally felt that any student that is sincere about his/her evaluation will not be intimidated by signing their evaluations. Mr. March stated that he did not understand why students appeared to be such a threat to faculty members. Through evaluations, faculty members may realize their own failings and improve upon their techniques. Mr. Carey stated that at one time he believed in the credibility of student evaluations of professors, but he now sees them as having a negative effect on the educational process. Professors are leaning more and more toward popular teaching methods.

Mr. Quane questioned Mr. Christiansen's reasons for providing for the collection of evaluations each term. Mr. Christiansen stated that he wanted to provide for the semester change of classes and students. The faculty members need as much feed-back as possible with evaluations. He suggested to those Senate members who had difficulties with specific points of the proposal to consider other points and possibly modifications.

Mr. Carlile stated that it seemed as if the Senate was debating whether or not to have student evaluations. The Board of Regents has already stated that there shall be student evaluations. Mr. Carlile felt that student evaluations are good for both students and professors and that they encourage student participation. He argued the substitute proposal more clearly spells out the policy. He supported approval of Mr. Christiansen's provision for anonymity of student evaluations, because of the candor that is provided. Mr. Carlile expressed discontent with the inconsistency in the forms of evaluations, since they vary from department to department.

Ms. Parterson raised the question of who will be in charge of collecting and maintaining the evaluations. Mr. Goldstein supported her question by stating that if the proposal is to be specific then it should be stated as to who will collect the evaluations and who will handle them.

Mr. Young questioned Mr. Christiansen's provision for forwarding the evaluations to the College Faculty Status Committees. Mr. Christiansen stated that he did not want the information provided by evaluations to be used only on the departmental level.

Mr. Wilson objected to writing a detailed proposal such as this on the floor of the Senate. Mr. Watkins stated that student evaluations are always a big problem at Universities. If the evaluations are to be systematic, it will be difficult to handle them more than once a year. He used an example of how evaluations were used at West Texas University. Students were to sign their evaluations of professors, but all the ratings were computerized and the professors received only the results. The Senate should investigate how other schools handle their evaluations. Mr. Cohel observed that we already have a policy on student evaluations; these proposals are merely clarifications.



Mr. Ritt commented that the Department of Mathematics has had open-ended evaluations and will probably continue. He also mentioned the problems involved in reading all of them. The Math Department registers 4,000 students per semester and that has resulted in about 8,000 open-ended evaluations per year to be read. The Math Department requires signature so that students are more responsible in their responses.

Mr. March suggested that students should be informed of the weight their evaluations will have if they sign their names. It would clear the departments of being forced to use anonymous statements in procedures.

Mr. Christiansen stated that in his proposal there is still flexibility for Departments. He attempted to give departments the decision of the weight that student evaluations will carry. In response to earlier remarks made by Ms. Patterson and Mr. Carey, he stated that he is paramoid of faculty because of the backlash that may hurt students when signing an unfavorable evaluation. Not signing an evaluation allows the student to be more honest in his judgments and, therefore, he/she will make a greater effort to be fair and accurate.

Mr. Hicklin recommended that the Faculty Affairs and Student Affairs Committees continue to study the question. Mr. Carlile agreed and stated that the proposal submitted by Mr. Christiansen should be supported. Mr. Moonan asked if there would be a problem with delaying and reconsidering the proposal. He asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee would like to withdraw their motion for approval, but the response appeared negative.

On a roll call vote, the substitute motion proposing Mr. Christiansen's recommendations was defeated 13-26-3.

IX, 48 A motion (Carlile/Cooper) to table the proposed policy from the Faculty Affairs Committee was made. The motion was withdrawn.

IX, 49 A motion (Carlile/Rice) to recommit the question to Committee was made. Mr. Carlile expressed concern over the faculty-student split on the vote, and he felt the Faculty Affairs Committee should come up with something more specific. Mr. Hicklin stated that the faculty and the BOR need some immediate reassurance that the Senate is going to install their policy. Mr. Young reminded the Senate that all the Committee wants to do is place a single statement in the ASPT document.

Mr. Quane stated that if the policy was recommitted to the Committee, it probably would not be dealt with for quite a while, because of the emphasis placed on the ASPT document revisions. He stated that the policy statement is only one of principle. Mr. Smith objected to returning the policy statement to Committee because it is in keeping with the general wording of the ASPT document itself. Mr. Christiansen apologized for bringing his proposal to the Senate floor instead of through Committee, but stated that the issue deserves further study and student input.

On a roll call vote, the motion to recommit the policy to Committee was defeated 19-20-3.

Mr. Carlile stated that, as a student, he did not feel that the original statement from the Faculty Affairs Committee reflected student concerns on the matter. He realized the importance of evaluations for faculty, but there is also the importance of them for students to be considered. Mr. Hicklin responded that the statement itself is a bigger step for students than some realized. The statement will

serve as a local policy, instead of only BOR policy. The issue of student evaluations is an on-going one, subject to change and alteration.

- IX, 50 A motion (Rutherford/Hicklin) to amend the proposal to say that the departments will decide how the evaluations will be collected and that they will place the method to be used in writing in the respective College office was made. Mr. Rutherford stated that he supported a method by which anyone can find out how evaluations are to be handled. Mr. Young stated that every department has criteria to be used for handling evaluations. Mr. Hicklin stated that not all departments follow this procedure. The amendment will remove inconsistencies in procedures. Mr. Goldstein asked why Mr. Rutherford wanted the procedures filed in College offices, and Mr. Rutherford responded that it will provide for a central location.

The amendment to the motion was approved.

- IX, 51 A motion (March/Emerson) to amend the policy with a proviso that evaluations shall be taken following each academic term was made. The Chairperson proclaimed the amendment dilatory.

- IX, 52 A motion (Carlile/Greathouse) challenging the Chairperson was made. Mr. March stated that he failed to see how his motion was dilatory since evaluations could be taken every three years without provisions against that possibility. Mr. Cohen stated that the items had already been voted upon. The challenge to the Chairperson's ruling was defeated on a roll call vote of 17-21-2.

- IX, 53 A motion (Hicklin/Upton) to move to an immediate vote was made. The motion was approved on a voice vote.

On a roll call vote, the policy statement as proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee with the Rutherford amendment was approved 27-14-1.

#### Student Elections Code

Mr. Rice explained the amendments that had been distributed to members of the Senate as being approved by the Association of Residence Halls and the Student Association Assembly. The amendments recommend changes in the provisions for the Student Elections Committee's budget, procedures for determining negligence of the committee, procedures for the filing of petitions, and policies on canvassing in residence halls. A motion (Rice/Cooper) to accept the proposed Student Elections Code, as amended, was made. The motion was approved on a voice vote.

IX, 54

#### Academic Plan

Dean Rives was present to answer any questions about the Academic Plan. He began by stating that two proposals have been withdrawn from the Plan. The Bachelor's Program Major for Business Information Systems has been withdrawn, but the University Curriculum Committee has approved a Business Information Systems sequence under four existing majors under the College of Business. The Master's Program in Counselor Education Human Systems Development has also been withdrawn from the plan. The Graduate Council has approved a similar sequence within the existing Counselor Education program.

Mr. Koehler introduced Section I of the document, Illinois State University Institutional and Collegiate Missions. Mr. Christiansen questioned the value of efforts to decrease the undergraduate to graduate student ratio which is already

about 90:10. Provost Horner responded that the general consensus is that undergraduate programs are stronger, because of the nature of the faculty members that are attracted to the institution. The relative cost of some of the graduate programs is high because of the small programs. Mr. Christiansen asked what a desirable ratio is and when efforts to expand graduate enrollment will stop. Provost Horner stated that the committee could not state a precise ratio goal, but the University should try to increase instead of decrease, graduate enrollment.

Mr. Goldstein discussed the statement about seeking accreditation to enhance academic programs. In line with the discussion at the last Senate meeting, he argued the link between accreditation and quality is tenuous at best. Provost Horner responded that it was the feeling of the subcommittee that it is to ISU's advantage to have its academic programs accredited. Mr. Goldstein stated that there is some question as to the result of accreditation on some parts of the University. Mr. Goldstein also expressed concern with the statement that ISU supports a liberal arts preparation for students, instead of a vocational approach. He felt it was at variance with the facts.

Mr. Christiansen questioned statements made concerning the growth of the College of Business. Mr. Horner stated that the College is not expected to grow appreciably within the near future because of limited sources that are available.

Mr. Christiansen requested a definition of the Teacher CORPS Program offered through the College of Education. Mr. Hicklin stated that it is a federally funded project for training teachers on a broad basis. Mr. Watkins added that it is usually utilized to train inner city teachers.

Mr. Quane asked about the continued emphasis on the telelecture network in the College of Continuing Education. Mr. Horner stated that there was a large group of people who were pleased with the program. The telelecture network's greatest attribute is simultaneously teaching programs in five or six places.

Mr. Quane also asked about the Kellogg Project and its activities. Dean Rives responded that a report on the Kellogg Project will be issued within a week and will describe extensively the operations and evaluation results of the Project. In the Teaching-Learning Center about fifteen seminar-workshops have been conducted. The direction is toward more specifically tailored programs. There have been more applications for educational leaves than can be accommodated.

Mr. Ritt conducted discussion on Part II of the Plan, Academic Plan for New Programs and Improvements in Existing Programs. He stated that the Academic Affairs Committee did not review at great length the large number of programs presented in the section. All of the programs must be approved by the Senate eventually. The concern of the Committee was with the consistency of the section. Mr. Moonan added that there was no extensive information such as that included in the NEPR documents.

Mr. Quane asked if the incorporation of the Arts and Sciences major into the contract major means that the Arts and Sciences major does not exist anymore. Dean Rives responded that it exists as a subdivision of the contract major. It will be listed in the catalogue and administered as it has been in the past.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked about the Masters Program in Women's Studies. He asked who is responsible for developing the program and why the Philosophy Department was not included among the planners. Dean Rives responded that Pat Chesebro is the



coordinator. He could not answer Mr. Rosenbaum's second question and suggested he speak with Ms. Chesebro.

Mr. Goldstein asked about two bachelor's programs, Legal Studies and Public Health. He asked how ISU will fair in training people when it has no legal or medical schools. Dean Rives stated that students in prelaw or premedical training are advised not to enter these programs. The market for graduates of these two programs is in paralegal and paramedical fields. Placement is good in the Public Health program, due to the internships available in the program.

Mr. Smith stated that under Community Problems Resource and Research Center, there should be a place for the Community Advisory Committee. The committee could find the Center to be very useful. Dean Streeter stated the point is well taken; the Center proposal came from the Department of Sociology-Anthropology and is taking an interdisciplinary turn.

Ms. Greathouse led discussion on Part III, University-Wide Services and Programs. Mr. Christiansen asked why the section on Greek organizations was deleted. Dean Rives responded that the committee decided it was inappropriate. Mr. Rutherford suggested entering it under the Student Affairs division. Dean Rives stated that if the Senate felt it was necessary to include it, an amendment to place it in would be necessary. Mr. Rutherford stated that there is a liaison to the Greek Council, Black Affairs Council, and other student organizations from the Office of Student Organizations, Activities, and Programs, so that might be an appropriate place to enter information on Greek organizations.

Mr. Smith asked if Placement Service could do some work with students to find out what kinds of positions they have obtained once they have graduated. Mr. Gamsky stated that the Service has been obtaining follow-up data for quite a few years, especially on Education graduates. It has been difficult to get responses from students who have already obtained jobs. Telephone surveys are taken and results reported to Departments.

Ms. Upton stated that under the section of University Studies, one of the goals is to reduce class size. She asked if there is a particular goal in mind. Dean Rives stated that a number would be difficult to require, since the size of classes vary from department to department, a specific goal is a disciplinary matter.

Mr. Rutherford questioned the interpretation of Union use for public events. Jude Boyer suggested that clarification is necessary, but the term presently includes all events that occur in that building. Mr. Law expressed his concern that there should be a section for Married Student Housing under the section on the Association of Residence Halls, because there is also a group that reports for the married students.

There was little discussion about Sections IV and V of the document. Dean Rives commented briefly on the newly added Section VI, which was distributed at the Senate meeting.

#### North Central Association Report

Mr. Cohen stated that the NCA Report will be only an Information item and will not pass into the Action stage. Dean Rives stated the Report has been compiled to inform the ISU Community on events taking place for NCA accreditation. The first and last chapters were distributed among the Senators. Dean Rives stated that ISU is seeking reaffirmation instead of the accreditation itself, because the University

can receive better funding only through the appropriate agency's accreditation. Pages 5 ff show the various committees involved in preparing the report. Page 9, Overview, gives a summary of the total report. The process used in the self-study report is one with four stages. There is a description of each area and a review of the strengths of each particular area; areas of concerns and problems are noted and recommendations are given on how to deal with them. The report's format is different from preceding years in that it is an evaluative report, not simply a descriptive one.

Dean Rives stated that the NCA evaluations team will be at ISU February 28, March 1 and 2. He recommended that senators review the Report in their particular area of concern, because the evaluation team may call upon anyone to report. It is the team's responsibility to see that the Report is an accurate self-study of ISU.

Mr. Moonan asked where the complete NCA Report may be found. Dean Rives stated that there are copies available in departmental and college offices, in the senate office, at Milner Library, and in the Student Association Office as well as his own office.

Mr. Ritt commented that he had read a section of the NCA Report and did not understand it. He felt the Report to be an embarrassment to the University. Dean Rives suggested that Mr. Ritt direct his comments to those responsible for the section he referred to; there is provided in the document a list of those ISU faculty, students, and administrators who compiled the Report.

#### Committee Reports

Academic Affairs: Mr. Moonan stated that the Committee's next meeting will concern the Academic Plan which will appear as an action item at the January 11 Senate meeting.

Administrative Affairs: Mr. Goldstein announced that the next Committee meeting will be held December 8 at 4 p.m. in DeGarmo, 435 F. Requests from the Parking Committee to increase membership size will be considered.

Budget Committee: Mr. Boaz stated that the December 6 Committee meeting has been rescheduled for December 8 in Stevenson 133 E at 3:30 p.m.

Executive Committee: Mr. Christiansen announced that the next Committee meeting will be held December 14, at 4 p.m., in Hovey 308. A discussion of the parking situation will be held with Charles Morris.

Faculty Affairs: Mr. Quane stated that the Committee is still working on the ASPT document Discussion began on the Committee's clarification of the term "faculty" as used in the ISU Constitution. A proposal was distributed among the senators which suggested including professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors and lecturers in the definition. Ms. Kuhn questions the inclusion of lecturers as faculty since they would then hold the same rights and privileges as faculty. Mr. Quane stated that their inclusion was provided for because of the College of Fine Arts' full-time use of lecturers.

Mr. Smith supported a looser type of definition so that valuable people would not be excluded from committees. He questioned the matter of tenure being affected by the altered definition. Provost Horner responded that there is no tenure issue involved in the clarification of the term.

Mr. Cohen spoke on the historical intent of the loose wording in the section of the Constitution under discussion. He stated that the framers were concerned that University professors and distinguished professors might not be considered full professorships.

IX, 55 A motion (Cohen/Hicklin) to amend the definition of faculty by deleting "lecturer" was made. Mr. Sanders objected to the lack of clarification in terms of tenureability. Mr. Horner stated the problem centered more in the term of employment.

Mr. Hicklin emphasized that change in the definition could create an inconsistency with BOR policy. Other Universities will be affected within the Regency system and lecturers at those Universities will use ISU as an example. Mr. Watkins suggested that if there was a question on BOR policy, an interpretation could be easily acquired.

Ms. Kuhn objected to the fact that the issue had come to the Senate floor through Committee reports instead of the normal informational and action stages. Mr. Christiansen responded that sense of the Senate resolutions are generally used to make interpretations in documents.

On a voice vote, the proposed amendment to delete "lecturer" was approved.

Mr. Cohen stated the Faculty Affairs Committee should carefully consider the implications of lecturers teaching regular courses. For example, under the University's financial exigency policy which makes length of service a prime criterion, do we let go a tenured faculty member of eight years standing before a Professional and Technical staff member with twelve years of service.

Ms. Patterson asked if we follow AAUP guidelines. Mr. Horner replied, yes, and under these guidelines temporary faculty can be rehired indefinitely, but we have University policy not to rehire after seven years without tenure.

IX, 56 Mr. Carlile felt the issue to be a very complex one and suggested that more information be given the Senate. A motion (March/Emerson) to recommit the clarification of the definition of faculty to the Faculty Affairs Committee was made. Mr. Moonan suggested that when the Committee returns to the Senate with its clarification there should be included some statement about the effect changes will have on the ISU community.

The motion was approved on a voice vote.

Rules Committee: Ms. Upton stated there will be a Committee meeting on January 18, at 7 p.m. in Stevenson 227 A. There have been some proposals submitted to the Committee on student representation on the Senate.

Student Affairs: Mr. Rutherford announced that the next Committee meeting will be held December 12, 5 p.m. in DeGarmo 551.

IX, 57 A motion (Emerson/Rice) to adjourn was approved at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ira Cohen, Chairperson  
John K. Boaz, Secretary

IC:JKB:ca



NAME	ATTEN-DANCE	VOICE							VOICE NOTE	
		Motion # 47	Motion # 49	Motion 52	Motion # 53	Motion =	Motion =	Motion #	Motion No.	YES
Boaz	P	No	No	No	Yes				44	X
Bowen	P	Present	Present	Present	Present				45	X
Butz	P	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No				46	X
Carey	P	No	No	No	Yes				47	Roll Call
Carlile	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No				48	withdrawn
Christiansen	P	Yes	yes	Yes	No				49	Roll Call
Cohen	P	No	No	Present	Yes				50	Yes
Cook	A exc.								51	Yes
Cooper	P	Yes	Yes	No	No				52	Roll Call
Croxville	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No				53	Roll Call
Egelston	P	Abstain	No	Present	Yes					
Emerson	P	No	Yes	Yes	No					
Goldstein	P	No	Yes	No	Yes					
Greathouse	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No					
Haves	P	No	No	Yes	Yes					
Heflin	A									
Henry	A									
Hicklin	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Jesse	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Karnstedt	A									
Koehler	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Kuhn	P	No	Yes	No	Yes					
Law	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No					
March	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
MaSSie	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No					
Mohr	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No					
Moonan	P	No	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Mosley	P	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes					
Nagy	P	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes					
Natale	P	No	No	Yes	Yes					
Patterson	P	No	Abstain	Yes	No					
Potter	P	No	Abstain	Yes	Abstain					
Quane	P	No	No	Yes	Yes					
Rhodes	A									
Rice	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No					
Ritt	P	No	Yes	No	Yes					
Rosenbaum	P	No	Yes	Yes	No					
Sanders	P	No	No	Abstain	Yes					
Searight	A									
Sims	A									
Smith	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Upton	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Vybiral	P	No	No	Yes	Yes					
Wilson	P	No	No	Yes	Yes					
Young	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Rutherford	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No					
Gamsky	P	Yes	No	No	Yes					
Belshe	P	No	No	No	Yes					
Horner	P	No	Abstain	No	Yes					
Watkins	P	No	No	No	Yes					